

Friends Bulletin

PACIFIC AND NORTH PACIFIC YEARLY MEETINGS OF THE RELIGIOUS SOCIETY OF FRIENDS

Volume 44 Number 4

December, 1975

CHINA REVISITED

The April and July issues of the Bulletin, which focus on "The Right Use of Resources" and "Community Living," prompt some comments and questions. While the articles contain much of value, I regret the somewhat cavalier manner in which China is dealt with. I feel that what is happening in China has a vital bearing on the social, economic, and political problems which provoke the earnest questing for a new society among Friends.

My own life and thought have been profoundly affected by China, and I am led to believe that it has a message that merits consideration in any discussion of the issues. What Quakers and China are seeking is in substance the same, namely, a cooperative commonwealth on earth. Dr. Joseph Needham, eminent English anthropologist, historian, Sinologue, says China is "nearer to, further on the way to, the true society of mankind, the kingdom of God, if you like, than our own."

Twice China compelled me to re-examine deep-rooted convictions: first, when we lived there in 1920-27, and again, when I returned in 1972 for a five-week visit. Marion Innerst and I began our career as missionaries in Canton, January 1920, having felt called, like many others, to obey the command, "Go ye therefore and teach all nations . . ." (Matt. 28:19). Disillusionment with the Christian mission, operating under the "unequal treaties," gradually set in. Finally, rejecting the protection of U.S. gunboats, we resigned.

We had gone to save the Chinese from their "heathenism" and Christianize them. On returning in 1972, an amazing experience awaited me. Our goal in the main, had seemingly been attained by "other missionaries." "A virtuous country without organized religion," says a Catholic priest of China.

The love ethic which we taught, supported by the theology of a seeking, loving God, had now been translated into the watchword of the nation, "Serve the people." What baffled me was a private and public morality higher than in my own "Christian" country, without a corresponding lofty theology to bear it up. "How do you explain it?" I am asked. I have no clear answer.

Another thing perplexing to a Quaker was that this society so peaceful and compassionate in contrast with the warring, competitive, brutal society we had lived in fifty years earlier, had come through violent revolution. I had always maintained that the means used, extend

themselves into and characterize the end achieved. What I found seemed to defy that thesis, so confidently taught over many years.

There is an explanation. Mao had said that when the enemies fought with guns are vanquished, there will still be enemies within (counter-revolutionaries) to be overcome without guns. Debate and persuasion are the weapons to be used in the new order, the Socialist State.

This was clearly stated under point 6 of the 16-point statement governing the Cultural Revolution: "The method to be used in debates is to present the facts, reason this out and persuade through reasoning. Any method forcing a minority holding different views to submit, is impermissible. The minority should be protected . . ."

That occasional outbreaks of violence occurred during the Cultural Revolution is true. Violence, as usual, captured the headlines in the American press, distorting the total picture. That there should have been so little in a nation of 800 million engaged in earnest debate is the truly newsworthy fact.

The remarkable story of "re-education" through "criticism, self-criticism, struggle" of the last twenty-six years has not yet been told. Here is an amazing creative force at work, which should intrigue Quakers. For it is peaceful non-violent reform, or revolution, producing the new man and the new society emerging in the People's Republic of China. Are we above learning anything from it?

This explains in part at least why a peaceful, compassionate society could follow a violent revolution. I am aware of unanswered questions, but space limitations prevent dealing with them.

I am not attempting to defend Mao or Maoism, for I am aware of their shortcomings. But to live up to the Quakerly profession of being "ethical people" and "publishers of truth," I must give credit where credit is due.

"Mao is not a God," as one Friend puts it. No, but his writings and achievements mark him as a genius. He turned around a fourth of the human race, steeped in life-stultifying and -destroying traditions and customs, and set its face in a new direction. He gave it an inspiring vision. Under his leadership, 500 million impoverished peasants, for whom life was all but meaningless, now live with dignity and purpose.

(continued on page 60)

FRIENDS BULLETIN

2081 Amherst St., Palo Alto, CA 94306
Telephone: (415) 321-9958

Robert R. Schutz, *Editor*

Myra Keen, *Assistant to the Editor*

Barbara Janoe, *Corresponding Editor for NPYM*

The official organ of news and opinion of Pacific Yearly Meeting and North Pacific Yearly Meeting of the Religious Society of Friends.

Second Class postage paid at Palo Alto, California.

PUBLISHED monthly except February and August at 2081 Amherst St., Palo Alto, California 94306. All correspondence, editorial and subscription, should be directed to mailing address above. Deadline for copy is fifth of the month preceding month of issue.

SUBSCRIPTION RATES: \$5.00 per year. First class postage \$8.00. Single copies \$1.00 postpaid. Monthly Meetings are encouraged to collect and subscribe for all of their members. Contributions beyond subscriptions are welcomed to help meet actual costs and reduce Yearly Meeting subsidies. All contributions are tax deductible; receipts sent on request.

ADVERTISEMENTS: \$0.50 donation per line, subject to approval of content.

REVOLUTION IN PROPERTY

Although property holders are notorious conservatives, we will argue here that revolution, which must be non-violent in order (1) to satisfy Friends, and (2) to work, can best (and possibly can only) be carried out in the area of property holding, and can be carried out by means which lie readily to the hand of every would-be revolutionary.

We will argue against — although we do not wish to denigrate — the isolated, desperate, individual act of protest against war and the system(s) which spawn(s) war, as being ineffective and even counterproductive of the desired end: revolution. Such acts are represented, from minimum to maximum, by Ross Flanagan sitting in the middle of the busiest intersection of Berkeley, Richard Taylor being run over by a train, and Norman Morrison's self-immolation. We celebrate the courage of these heroes, but we deplore the image they convey of non-violent revolution.

Our system of private property ownership has an open vein within it about a mile wide, which is there for the free use of revolutionaries to drain the abscesses that fat cats are upon the bodies economic and politic. This vein is the opportunity, which is always there, yawning like an open chasm, for individuals and groups to dedicate private property forever to community use. This vein is fed by two main arteries, namely, the knowledge (and

the guilt produced thereby) in property holders that income from these holdings, however easy and pleasant, is nothing but legalized theft from the rest of the community (which knowledge can be brought to the attention of property-holders frequently in an effort to get them to absolve themselves of crime), and the ability of revolutionaries to band together themselves, work hard, save money, and buy the fat cats out.

The potential power of these leakages is continually attested by the combined efforts of law, the judicial system, and particularly our system of inheritance, which are overwhelmingly devoted to the cause of keeping property in private hands, as if that aspect of our lives were, in the absence of these props, bound to go out of style. We are convinced that they would go out of style without these props, and that we can make them obsolete, propped up as they are, with conscious effort guided by idealism.

Two main obstacles have stood in our way in developing a non-rip-off economy. One is the lack of clear understanding of our goals and functions in such a state, and the other is failure to formulate institutions of integrity designed to receive and administer resources devoted to community welfare. It is not the purpose of this paper either to define the understanding or to develop the institutions — all of which must come about as the result of widespread community discussion and involvement. Here we begin and carry on some of the discussion and involvement.

In our experience a great many of those who come to join communities out of alienation and dissatisfaction with the system — and most of us feel some of this, particularly when young and before we come into our inheritances — suffer from an acute case of indigestion and want to throw the whole thing up. We reject its productivity, affluence, crime, money, interest, rent, hard work, study, and understanding — thinking we can get away from these evils into some haven of utopia and irresponsibility. Such indiscriminate rejection by the drop-out generation will never create or carry through a genuine revolution. If money is to be rejected as well as rent because the functions of neither one are understood, the failure of our revolution can be attributed to our own arrogance and stupidity.

Likewise, if we can offer no better institutions into which to place our property than the American Friends Service Committee, which we love and adore, but which will spend it on band-aids for Society's systemic illnesses, or Friends' Meetings, which will fight over it until tired protagonists have succeeded in dissipating it, or the Catholic Church, which will build cathedrals and feed priests, or city governments, which are run by the Mafia for the benefit of leeches, and if we offer none save heavenly rewards to fats who cooperate with us (and we judge these to be the state of our present art in accepting the community gift), then we have little to blame but

ourselves if we haven't yet tapped the vein. The land trust is a good beginning, which also contains flaws.

Intentional communities could develop the requisite understanding, criteria, and institutions to bring off this revolution. So far (they are a young phenomenon in the present context of revolutionary ferment) they appear too ingrown and occupied with building themselves to offer much chance of a 50-year wider-community revolution. We hope that this will change.

Before we leave the fascinating prospect of a real revolution in Property conducted according to Friends' principles, we should speculate on the time horizon of accomplishment in case we succeed in diverting this jugular vein toward the building of community resources. Such speculation is, of course, extremely hazardous, since the revolution depends entirely for its implementation upon the will of the troops — troops which are mostly asleep as of now.

If a community of 100 (25 men, 25 women, and 50 children) were to work hard at regular jobs for a period of 10 years, and if the community mores dictated that they live at a frugal but adequate level, it is entirely possible that they could finance their own housing needs, which would require a good deal of development, and save \$200,000 in addition, which could be applied to the development costs of another such community. But a middle-class community can finance its own development from previously saved or inherited resources. This means that such communities can double every 5 years by dint of hard work and saving alone. In addition, gifts from the over-indulged, if assiduously and intelligently sought, can increase the doubling rate, in our judgment, to three years. In addition, if, as we expect, intentional community building is increasingly seen as a good thing by middle-class Americans, then initial starts in various places can, we believe, increase the doubling rate to every year.

If we now have 100 such communities in the United States, comprising 10,000 people it would take 12 years to cover more than half the U.S. population. This would be a pretty fast revolution, but of course it would start slower than this, build up faster to the point of great resistance to further expansion, and then taper off to a trickle. By that time, the communities movement will have enough resources to buy up whatever else of America it seems worthwhile to acquire, and get on with doing work in the world.

It looks to us as though we have our work cut out in order to make revolution begin.

X. I. Stential
and
Con C. Quential

ON PROPERTY

Property must be a strange issue in the minds of Friends. I think it has something to do with Christmas, end-of-the-year tax planning, giving, the Prince of Peace, estates that occasionally settle on Meetings, economic responsibility, simple living, Meeting house ownership and use — and so I scheduled this issue in a most appropriate month in order to explore several of its many facets. I sent out the usual number of challenging invitations and bombed out, except for Stanley Shaw, who allowed that he might be the only person in NPYM brave enough to tackle it.

Thereupon, still hoping to present the issue and believing that courage is now required, I have resorted to a few close friends, guaranteed them anonymity, and implored their inmost thoughts. I don't believe you will be disappointed, but I certainly am surprised at Friends. Maybe we feel guilty?

RS

Faith and Life Movement

As a follow-up of the Faith and Life Conference held at Indianapolis last year, a booklet of devotional readings for family use will be prepared as the Spring issue, 1976, of *Fruit of the Vine*, which has been providing Friends with daily devotional readings for fifteen years. This issue will be the work of thirteen Friends representing all of the major Friends groups, and will consist of favorite Bible verses selected around seven themes (one for each day of the week), with a paragraph of commentary by the Friend choosing the verse. Interested individuals or Meetings may order copies @ 50¢ from *Fruit of the Vine*, P.O. Box 232, Newberg, OR 97132.

Ancient John Smith's Ministry: 1764

“Those early Friends were rich,”
they say. I can see one now,
hat in hand, rising to pray.
Gold and silver fall
from his mouth like hail,
paper, soft as snow.
Too heavy to rise, it piles up
around his feet, to his knees,
his shoulders, and finally
over his head. Looking back we see
a pillar of loot.

Robert Piper
Santa Cruz Meeting

SURPLUS

Surplus is a worrisome thing. If you haven't got a cushion, you are likely to get hurt when you fall down. And we all fall down. So some of us work very hard to build that cushion to fall down on. And we save, and save, and save. String as well as money. But then we find that the moth and rust do indeed consume. And the robber steals it away. And the confidence man gains our confidence. And inflation beats down our hedges against inflation. And the wolves shear us sheep in investments. We *really* aren't money managers.

So we listen for awhile to the siren song of the foolish virgins. (My, the Bible has a lot of apt, and conflicting, analogies!) And we undertake subsistence living at the request of our simple brothers and sisters (simple livers we become with vast abandon). S.L.'s have Jesus on their side, of course, who told the rich young ruler to sell all he had and give to the poor (who would squander it on simple living, of course). And we know that it works for our saffron-clad brothers the monks who go about every day with their begging bowls. All we really have to do is let the Lord provide and manna will fall from heaven, loaves and fishes will multiply, and population can increase forever.

But then, after a period of youthful innocence and laziness, our mother has a stroke which will make her a vegetable for thirty years, and our father suffers a lingering cancer. (Let's see, is it one out of 5 of us that are going to get cancer now with all the plutonium hanging around from the bomb tests?) We throw them out on the street to die, of course, but it does give us a pang. That pore ol' mother!

If we are foresighted and responsible enough to swing back to earning and saving before this happens, we get caught in money management, which we do poorly, and if we don't lose our shirts, or our cushions, and don't have bad luck on our way out, we leave our small nest-eggs to sons and daughters who fight over bones after taxes and attorneys and executors have sliced off the meat. Or we endow our favorite charities with further orders from the dead.

What a miserable set of options for the individual in this society! It's almost enough to make one want to change the system. We might even go that far if we thought about our fate and if some fairly bright person would only come along and tell us how to do it while we were in a receptive mood. Psssst! What do you think all of this build-up is for?

We hark back to the old community concept which is so good for so many of the nasty little problems of life. In fact, it may easily be held that the primary or fundamental purpose of intentional community is to deal with surplus. (By us materialists, of course! Let some other communitier rap about the spiritual and psychological benefits and let some other critic tell you it's too difficult

or it can't be done! We're going to concentrate on surplus).

What do we want out of our economic surplus in this life, anyway? I think it is emotional security born of the knowledge that our sickness and accidents and unemployment and old age and death will be cared for in decent comfort and dignity. Trying to provide for these things on an individual basis leads to the the assumption of ridiculous risk and tends to greed in order to satisfy a need that is unknown and can't be met. We let the State take over some of these functions with its inadequate programs and professional people-handlers, and the State properly strips us of assets in return for its kindness. If you ever had any thought of doing good with your money (whatever monument you retain of your life work), forget it after you ask the State's participation. It is better than nothing, but an extremely unsatisfactory "solution" for those of us who haven't gotten used to sucking on the welfare teat.

I should not neglect the misguided among us who want to leave money to their children. If, after giving them a good education and start in life we want to load them with a dose of luxury in a starving world, by all means, we should spoil them. If we want to promote fights among the children and bitterness at our sainted memories in our heirs, by all means, we should endow them. But if our children can have their emotional and physical needs cared for in a community of loving people just as we can, let's give our surplus to the community, today, now as we go along, while we're alive and can see it do some good.

I won't bother to discuss the Friends among us (if any) who accumulate surplus as a source of power — a private action that lies beneath contempt.

If we give (or lend, i.e., bequest with life estate) our surplus to our intentional community (the intention is primarily care of every sort for every member of the community), and if we have worked hard and saved a lot during a long, productive life, and if others do likewise, it is possible that our community will develop a surplus in its turn. Is it likely that the group (i.e., all of us together) will suffer the same problems with surplus that we did as individuals? In my view, this is unlikely and unnecessary.

The community has many options for investment not open to the individual. One of these is to buy and build or rebuild its housing facilities. Hardly any housing in the U.S. today facilitates the community process, i.e., living in close proximity, meetings for business and pleasure, education, gardens, community projects, shared activities, etc., at the level of the extended family. Another option is the undertaking of production for the market in a way that embodies the community's values. Surely the competitive rat race is not one of those values. Competition will have to be faced in the market, but the total weight of the fight among ourselves is not our bag, and it will take up a lot of surplus to

Letter

Earthquaker Afterthoughts

On October 17 through 19, about thirty people gathered at Quaker Center to learn about the Earthquakers' hopes for Monan's Rill, and to clarify the meaning of "community" in our individual situations. During the course of that weekend, I felt within myself a deepening unease about what I perceive to be a tendency towards exclusivity that is inherent in the Monan's Rill project. None of my thoughts are new or foreign to the founders of the Monan's Rill community, but it may serve some purpose to call them afresh to mind.

For one thing, it is unlikely that anyone who is not a Quaker, or who does not have tight Quaker connections, will become a member of the Monan's Rill community. The manner in which the project is "advertised," and the extensive screening process that is required (including the necessary prior membership in Earthquakers) almost guarantee exclusivity in terms of current religious affiliation.

For another, the monetary price of admission is quite high. While work is underway to adjust the price structure in favor of individuals and younger couples, there is no attention being given to an "ability to pay" criterion, as such. The orientation seems to be more, "Whom do we need to attract?" than "How can we open the com-

provide productive facilities built according to community ethics.

If our community continues to provide surplus — and it will unless we provide privilege for ourselves in the form of "the leisure world" (while others are starving!), we can lend or give that surplus to other communities not so fortunate as we who meet our community standards (i.e., not welfare or rip-off types). I know my bias is showing, but you are free to defend rip-off if you like in your letter to the editor. This begins to look suspiciously like the trickle-down theory long associated with conservative Republicanism. Fear not, brother (sister). There is nothing wrong with overflow so long as we are frugal (ethical) for ourselves and really make that cup overflow — as Republicans in general do not.

And when we've satisfied the demand for communities in the land, we can look abroad for places to put our surplus. We will not run out for awhile, and when we do, the world will be a better place for our children.

I don't advise us to rush into community. Take a few years and choose your companions wisely. The way is tough enough in the reeducation that community will require of all who embrace it, but embrace it. The rewards are wonderful.

Anon Y. Mous

munity more equitably?"

Still another factor is the site itself. Relatively remote, it will be most attractive to those who can afford to live there without doing remunerative work, and to those who perceive in themselves relatively little need for extensive participation in the larger social and political fabric. Indeed, most of Monan's Rill's membership, for many years to come, will be preoccupied with certain aspects of the community, narrowly defined.

There are additional exclusionary influences of a more subtle sort. They have to do, for example, with the first residents' image of "what ought to be," the peculiar interaction and governance styles of Quakers, the nature of the physical structures that are first erected, and the legal/financial instruments that are chosen. My impression is that, in sum, Monan's Rill will necessarily and soon find itself relatively isolated from the milieu in which Quakers must work in order for the unity of "Faith and Practice" to be of greatest social use.

My purpose is not to render a judgment. Fundamentally, it is to help me choose my own personal course most sensitively and intelligently. Secondarily, it is to query what "praxis," the merger of faith and practice, should mean to Quakers in operational terms. Incidentally, I would hope that the founders of Monan's Rill, many of whom have understandably reacted to the very kinds of engagement styles I have implied above, will keep in mind the continuing challenge to be open and embracing and involved. Somewhere there is a balance.

Paul Niebanck
Santa Cruz Meeting

[I had thought to answer the criticisms of Friends Gustafson (July, p.157) and Niebanck, above, but Friend Mous takes the long view, as I would, in which it seems to me their impatience and self-satisfaction melt away. —Ed.]

Arizona Half-Yearly Meeting

Approximately 65 Friends from meetings at Flagstaff, La Vegas, Phoenix, Tucson, and Tempe met at Phoenix October 11-12. Officers for the next two-year period are: La Donna Wallen, clerk; Ann Hardt, recording clerk; Alice Raymond, treasurer.

Loren Austin will represent Arizona as one of three representatives to Friends Committee on National Legislation from Intermountain Yearly Meeting.

A mailgram to the chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee was approved, urging him to work toward an immediate hearing on the World Peace Tax Fund.

(Continued on page 58)

NOT AT THE MEETING HOUSE

(I shall undoubtedly make mistakes in reporting this matter, since all I have is scattered notes, conversations, letters, and the official minutes of Santa Monica's Meeting of decision. But it is too important an issue to neglect. Perhaps Friends will try to clarify mistakes in reporting, rather than react with anger or disappointment. —Ed.)

The bare bones of the issue are that Family Synergy, a group that advocates and practices open, multiple sexual relationships among adults (involving children at least as spectators), asked for renewal of their privilege to meet and discuss their philosophy, hear speakers and socialize (but not to practice their sexual fantasies) at the Santa Monica Meeting House, as they had been doing for the previous year. As brought to the Meeting, the views of this group collided with the views of some Members, and according to the policy previously adopted for use of the Meeting House, permission was denied. That policy reads as follows: "Favorable consideration shall be given for usage only to those proposals which are demonstrably not incompatible with, or contradictory of, the Friendly purposes, goals, and orientation of our Meeting." Anne Friend, a member of Santa Monica Meeting who belongs to Family Synergy, left the meeting in tears. The adopted Minute follows: "As of now there is no unity in approving the use of the meeting house by the Family Synergy group. Many Friends present do feel that the Family Synergy group does have a valuable purpose that is in sympathy with Friends' principles. We as Friends need to consider further at some future time these questions of alternate life styles."

After a telephone call from the Bulletin, E. Parl Welch, Clerk of the Meeting, who stepped down as clerk in order to cross examine those who requested permission, sent a three-page letter of comments, some of which are selected here. "You wondered about 'free speech,' but I hardly consider this as an issue in this case. Members of Family Synergy are free to speak all they want about their program and, as has happened, to try to convert into membership . . . Members and atten-

ders have a right to promulgate their utopian fantasies as individuals, but to grant usage by an organization is a different matter since, in so doing, endorsement of its program, motivations and goals is implied, if not explicated . . . I had had two people come to me as an Analytical Psychologist for help with problems arising from their participation in F/S's program, so I was familiar with what went on before reading their materials. To mention a few of the problems: broken marriages, jealousies, injury to children, emphasis on raw sexuality, difficulties arising from having multiple wives and husbands simultaneously, problems of "who's the father?, etc."

Anne Friend writes, "The whole experience was good for the meeting, but . . . I feel that it is very unfortunate that the opponents are much less articulate in giving reasons for their feelings than those convinced of the value of the change . . . Too much emotional involvement also tends to shift standards. During the first meeting one member who is single but not celibate commented that no one has ever taken nearly as much interest in his health or that of his friends as the Meeting has taken in Synergy families. Similarly, psychic trauma to my children was not an issue when we were trying to live a pacifist life in a military community, but it is when I adopt a multi-lateral family style in a nominally monogamous society. But the two actions are, for me, essentially the same. Both express love, the affirmation of life, and the value of each individual, which are very near the core of what being a Friend means to me."

Your reporter has been unable by questions to elicit any sense of the inappropriateness of carrying on the argument over Family Synergy program at the Meeting level, which seems to be the core of any free speech issue. But no one states this better than Stanley Shaw in the next article.

RS

WHO IS MY NEIGHBOR?

Tacoma Friends Meeting is periodically called upon to rent its facilities to the local Communist Party for a public meeting. We have several times made this accommodation, not without protest from some members of the Meeting, even threat of resignation. If other Meetings have faced this dilemma, Tacoma Friends would eagerly welcome any guidance deriving from such experience.

This writer is not nor ever has been in any way connected with the Communist Party, and can if necessary adduce abundant evidence of his loyalty to this land of his birth. But as a card-carrying Quaker and a birth-right New Testament Christian, known locally as an advocate for Blacks, Jews, foreigners, pacifists, and other disad-

(Continued from page 57)

Bob Vogel of the Pasadena AFSC office reported on his trip to the Middle East and also shared information on AFSC's efforts in Vietnam.

An evening program on William Penn was provided by Friends General Conference in anticipation of the Bicentennial.

Olive Goodykoontz, Reporter

vantaged neighbors, I frankly believe that the Meeting is morally and historically obliged to prove neighbor to these victims of a bigoted society.

Let it be granted that communism as practiced by its principal exemplar, the U.S.S.R., is utterly diabolical in numerous restrictions on freedom — Solzhenitsyn, Sakharov, Siberia and plenty else are evidence sufficient. Before casting the second stone, we might cross the Atlantic and look back west at Sacco-Vanzetti, the Rosenbergs, armament to both sides in the Middle East, the Bay of Pigs, human slavery, genocide, the war in Southeast Asia, child labor — the list is long and sorry. In theory, there are some things about communism which can be rated as admirable: they generally want to secure a better distribution of wealth by moving the proletariat into the seats of power, restricting ownership of natural resources and monopolies to all the people, collective farming, and so on. Their achievements compared to private capitalism are not convincing, but much of life is trial and error; who ever learned all about anything without making mistakes? Communism is a very important fact of life in this century, I vote high honor to Dwight Eisenhower after his war contacts with the Russians, for introducing a course in the subject at Columbia University when he became president. That was being realistic.

I am old enough to have known some flesh and blood commies, and found them as human as I am — not creatures with cloven hoofs, spear-point tails, and flaming breath as sometimes painted. They have been more informed and concerned about the social order than most of my friends — suggesting that if I have to choose between Joe Stalin and Joe McCarthy, I'd find one Joe as unacceptable as the other.

Through the years I have had frequent occasion to enlist the cooperation of schools, churches, and at least one college in presenting speakers for peace. So often have I been given the run-around that I have wondered whether there is anybody left in the world who is on the side of the angels. I recall Edmund Burke's observation that "The one assurance of the triumph of evil is that enough good men do nothing."

I cannot forget the disabilities visited on 17th century Quakers for their non-conformity, plus the hanging of four of them on Boston Common (including two women) forsooth because they advocated freedom. A count urged against Jesus was that he dined with publicans and sinners. He said that he came not to call the righteous, but sinners to repentance. It's time we spike this business of guilt by association. Why don't we have some of the old-time Quakers' holy boldness and stand up to these holier-than-thou people? It has been said, "If you salute your brethren only, what do you more than others?"

I have said nothing of the prudential reasons for being more tolerant of these suppliants at our door. We cumber the ground with our somewhat costly facility, and must

in fullest measure justify it. As American citizens, these people have a right to be heard, and when they are rebuffed on all sides, maybe it is our duty, nay, our privilege, to prove neighbor to these who have fallen among thieves. Now and again maybe some of them would join our team. They always pay rent.

Stanley T. Shaw
Tacoma Meeting

Stuart Innerst

J. Stuart Innerst, Peace Committee chairman of La Jolla Monthly Meeting, died suddenly in his La Jolla home August 30, 1975. His life began 81 years ago in Dallastown, Pennsylvania.

As a young man, encouraged by his mother, he decided on a career in the ministry. His training was at Lebanon Valley College, Pennsylvania; United Seminary, Dayton, Ohio; and Union Theological Seminary; also some graduate work at Columbia University.

He and his wife, Marion Reachard, went to China as missionaries in 1920. Seven years later they left in protest against Western interference in China's affairs. Two pastorates in Ohio followed, and a period of writing for religious publications. Then in 1946 he and Marion came to California, where from 1957 for six years he was minister at First Friends Church, Pasadena. His concern for world peace led to service with the AFSC, the Peace Board of California Yearly Meeting, and the Board of Peace and Social Concerns of Friends United Meeting.

During the 86th and 87th Congresses, he directed the "Friend in Washington" program, and four times in the 1960s was invited by the World Peace Council to conferences in Europe.

Stuart's love of China grew over the years. He chaired the Understanding China Committee of the AFSC and PYM's "Friend in the Orient" program. He was the first editor of the Understanding China Newsletter and one of 15 American Quakers who wrote "A New China Policy: Some Quaker Proposals."

Stuart's most treasured distinction came in 1972 when he was invited to visit the People's Republic of China, the first former American missionary to be so honored.

Marion Innerst died in 1964. In December, 1965 he married Gladis Barber Vorhees. Gladis, his two sons, two daughters, 17 grandchildren, and two great grandchildren, survive him. A memorial service was held in La Jolla on Sept. 13.

(Continued from page 53)

He is known chiefly for his dictum, "Power grows out of the barrel of a gun." (Could he cite a better illustration than U.S. policy in East Asia since 1945?) He is less well known for, "We must learn the spirit of absolute selflessness . . . With this spirit everyone can be very useful to the people." That a whole nation, the largest, should be trying to live by this ideal is unprecedented.

Mao's socialism cannot be bracketed with other socialism, as the editor seems to believe. Of course, Marxism, is taught, but in practice it is Marxism profoundly influenced by the thinking of China's sages, for centuries woven into the warp and woof of Chinese life. The result, a more compassionate, more humanitarian socialism.

It holds that human nature can be changed; that everyone, child or adult, if inclined to act anti-socially, needs to be shown the error of his way and persuaded to change. To persist is to become an enemy of society and one's own worst enemy, since the individual's highest good is bound up with that of the group. Delinquency and crime are thus avoided.

Hence the ongoing rectification meetings in home, neighborhood, school, work brigade, commune, factory, etc. "We don't need many courts and lawyers," my guide said in reply to my inquiry. "We settle many things among ourselves." Then a personal illustration. He was riding home on his bicycle one night, and took a chance on going through a red traffic light. He was stopped immediately by two pedestrians and charged with violating the law. "I knew better than to argue with them," he said, "for soon a crowd would gather and say, 'Now you might as well confess and promise not to do it again.'"

Everybody is his brother's keeper, concerned not only with his physical well-being, but his morality as well. Deviation from the norm was never honorable in China, nor is it today with the new norm: a society based on "Serve the people."

Freedom to "do your own thing," we argue, is freedom to be creative; creative, however, in two directions, for the common good or ill. Maoism contends that deviation from the ideal of the good society based on unselfish living is destructive and needs to be curbed. Question: To what extent must our inherited concept of freedom be limited in the interests of a "right sharing of resources," and ultimate human survival?

In the April issue, the editor writes, ". . . in every case in the modern world, including China, the rise of the Socialist State has been an unmitigated blood bath, which I judge is abhorrent to Quakers." But what of the rise of religious freedom, or political democracy and freedom? What country has shed more blood in the name of political freedom and democracy than ours? The pacifist can make a case against every war this nation fought.

Of course, bloodbaths are abhorrent to Quakers. It was this issue that perplexed me every day in the new China. I saw the new against the background of the old. I recalled the hopelessness of the oppressed peasant, the male-dominated woman, infanticide, boys and girls sold as slaves. Now, a peasant liberated from economic bondage; the woman, emancipated and educated; the children, loved and cared for, free and happy. It was indeed a paradise in contrast to the days when 20,000 bodies were scraped up each year from the streets of Shanghai.

I am not unmindful of the enormous cost in human lives. With Ax Nelson I want to cling to our "revolutionary ethic of non-violent goodwill," and counsel patience while love works its way. But for a member of the comfortable middle class (even though striving to simplify life) to counsel patience is one thing. Can I ever know how this sounds to that peasant in Sian, who tells me how his father gave his mother as a concubine to the cruel landlord, in part payment of debt, then a brother and a sister, and finally in desperation committed suicide?

Yes, deliver me from the "glib lingo of class warfare," but also from the subtle temptation to satisfy one's Quaker self-esteem with the glib lingo of non-violence. Two ways open, as Dr. Povey writes: reform or revolution. When I reject Mao's violent revolution in the China of the 1920s, what am I left with? A sobered, humbled sense of identifying with non-violent slow and gradual reform, while famine, flood, and disease continue to take their toll of China's oppressed millions. For how long? I take the Quaker way, but not with clean hands. I cannot extricate myself from the built-in violence of a society which is constantly crushing out the lives of numberless innocent people.

The new China provides no blueprint for this country, but it offers "precedents," as one observer puts it, for the solution of many problems which are world wide.

Is the movement toward small communities described in the Bulletin the answer? Desirable as ventures of this kind are in the quest for a new culture, they leave me with many questions. Do they have within them the rudiments of an adequate response to the challenge of our times? Do they address the issues of Western civilization in a state of collapse; of capitalism destroying itself from greed; of democracy untrue to itself and in decline; of authoritarian government on the rise; of the power of governments being usurped by multinational Cartels? Or are they a weak and inadequate compromise, a comfort to Friends moral principles, but inevitably too little and too late?

J. Stuart Innerst
La Jolla Meeting

(The final paragraph above was left incomplete in Stuart's typewriter, and has been completed in harmony with notes that he left. —Ed.)

Notes From The Meetings

Vital Statistics

Births

To Hershel and Gracia Hiatt of *Orange Grove* Meeting, a son, Arthur, on October 21.

Marriages

Ann Browder of *University Meeting* married Martin Lorenz in New Jersey, September 6.

Deaths

Wilfrid Webster, of *Redwood Forest* Meeting, October 27. A memorial meeting for him was held on October 30.

Orange Grove is now sponsoring a Vietnamese family, a couple with a 6-months-old child. The meeting is supplying housing and is assisting in job-hunting and adjustment to American ways.

Berkeley Meeting had a survey of interest in topics for discussion. Lead topic, with 21 votes, was Quaker History and Philosophy. Tied for second with 18 votes were Simple Living and The Meeting for Worship. Least often mentioned was PYM, with 2 votes.

The *American Friends Service Committee* is sending sweaters to Vietnam as part of its contribution to the Friend-Shipment Campaign, a nationwide coalition of religious and peace groups providing people-to-people aid. Children's sweaters (sizes 5 to 12) and yarn (preferably acrylic) or money for yarn are being accepted.

Guatemala Friends send a report on their Scholarship Fund. They have been able to visit with most of the scholarship holders of the past year and to establish the very real need that each has had for assistance. The Fund managers ask the recipients to pay back as they can after finishing their schooling and finding work. Thus the Fund may become revolving eventually. They are continuing the previous scholarships but are also planning to subsidize some week-long seminar courses on hygiene and to help two advanced students who are studying nursing and medicine. Contributions toward this work can be sent to Thomas C. Hunt, Apartado Postal 29-C, Guatemala.

Friends World Committee, Faith and Life Panel.

Quaker groups that split apart a century or more ago are being brought into closer contact by the Faith and Life Movement, under the general sponsorship of the FWC. A Panel of nine Friends has been appointed. Although Pacific Yearly Meeting has not arranged formally to send a representative, western Friends are reminded that PYM Minute 1975-24 approved authorizing the Treasurer to receive contributions for the use of Ferner Nuhn in his work with the Panel. Recently a meeting has been called for Richmond, Indiana. Contributions toward part of his travel expense would be welcomed.

ECONOMIC RESPONSIBILITY

Trustees tend to specialize in profit. They are responsible for endowment funds left for the support of worthy institutions often by people they can't consult (the dead). They invest in stocks and bonds in order to conserve principal, maximize income, and hedge against inflation. They can be sued, and fined, for giving careless or misleading or self-serving advice.

Stocks they buy do not simply pay dividends if the company makes a profit; they are subject to capital gain if buyers think they are going to make more profit in the future, and to loss if the bears are gloomy and prevail. Many other factors will drive the price of the stock up or down. So-called growth stocks, with little or no dividend, may be highly priced because that future expected gain equals the return expected on another stock which is not expected so to grow.

Judgment enters into any assessment of future profits. And the abilities of management. (Investment advisors will say, "I like the management of a Company," or "I don't"). And speculation. Wolves are waiting at every bend in the market to buy stocks that are "underpriced," sell those that are "overpriced," making gains either way at the expense of sheep who are less knowledgeable or quick or intuitive. Speculators tend to drive prices in the direction of their activities. If they sell in numbers the price drops; if they buy it rises — regardless of what may be going on in the company. And stocks may lose heavily when there is a depression and earnings become red ink. Similar pressures operate, with some differences, in the bond markets.

Our investment advisors become money managers and study these factors all of their time. They deal in chips and paper. (Old line, successful, dividend-paying companies are called "blue chips," as in poker). Our money managers are a harried lot, bowed with responsibility, sharp and tense, happy if they make 10%; in order to accomplish this end and support our hospitals and colleges, they must "beat the market" consistently.

Enter the Quaker radical. The economic responsibility which drives the trustee, as I have described it above, means nothing to him or her. She thinks about companies that make napalm or kill babies with drugs or burn the environment or will not hire women or blacks. She may also think of corporate giantism and meaningless jobs and lavish accommodations and bribery.

So the Friends Committee on Economic Responsibility was formed, in order to recognize and systematize these wider responsibilities and feed them in manageable portions to our money managers. Friendly trustees are not impervious to these new responsibilities; they are simply hard of hearing. But the radicals have become a little less shrill. They give us no more confrontations in big, old, wealthy Friends meeting these days. The radicals want ACTION.

(Continued on page 62)

(continued from page 61)

The FCER has not gone away, although it almost laid itself down when the Action slowed. Only 15 to 18 representatives came to its recent annual meeting. But these men and women, many of them money managers, continue to recognize all of their responsibilities as dealers in money and therefore power in this society. They have reconstituted the executive committee and are now looking for a paid part-time executive secretary to run seminars, collate information on economic responsibilities and funnel it especially to Friends money managers (for a price, of course), and deal imaginatively from the top of the deck with all our chips.

As a test of the water at that meeting one of the members proposed a set of tough criteria for an ideal or Friendly type of company in which Friends could invest with good conscience. (To our knowledge, no company now exists which can meet these criteria). The response was interesting. The clerk *pro tem* rejected it, saying we must restrict our activity to the practical. But several of those money managers expressed interest, asked for copies to study, and one suggested that it become an item for study at the FCER seminar on economic responsibility which will be conducted 3 hours a day 5 days at the Friends General Conference in Ithaca next summer, June 26 to July 3. Another proposed to take back the idea to his co-trustees that they allocate 5% of their capital to risky, socially productive enterprise, such as a company formed on this model might be. Still another's comment: "It would need management level to be a combination of saint and genius, and the rank-and-file to be saints! Oh well — 'tis a consummation to be wished!" We reproduce it here, for your suggestions if you like, and wonder what your reactions to it might be.

FRIENDS CRITERIA FOR ETHICAL INVESTMENT:

An Ideal Model

1. **Guaranteed Employment.** This means all employees commit to each other that they will share in the economic fate of the company. No one can be fired (Japanese system), although anyone can leave. No one can be transferred away from his home, friends, and community against his will. But a person may be assigned to any task in the plant.
2. **Governance by consensus.** This is not the Japanese system. Neither is it anarchy or inefficiency. It is compatible with delegation of authority and responsibility to managers and committees. It ensures community respect for the individual in major decisions of policy, does not allow for firing of personnel as a result of personal pique.
3. **Compensation limitation.** Lowest paid workers fare as well as the market, subject to consensus decision by the company in pursuit of guaranteed employment. Highest paid workers are paid more modestly than the market allows. Suggested ratio, 5:1. Within these over-all constraints, need may be recognized by consensus.
4. **Facilities limitation.** Facilities may be functional, efficient, designed to simplicity and beauty; they may not be highly expensive, ornate, spacious, or monumental. Equipment is selected with a view to economy. Research and experimentation within a global framework of need are encouraged; toys and gadgetry are not.
5. **Size limitation.** The optimum size of the community of workers is a very high priority of any company. Where technology requires larger size than optimum thus defined, research is constantly directed toward efficient units of smaller size, and units are organized by representation to allow maximum individual participation and responsibility without forfeiting democratic control.
6. **Environmental impact.** Every effort is made to minimize destruction, particularly of non-renewable resources and beauty. The status quo is not worshipped, but decisions reflect careful consideration for future generations.
7. **Product limitation.** Welfare of the human family as a whole is considered in the manufacture, distribution, and sale of every product. No product is made or moved which can substantially damage considerable numbers of the human family.
8. **Profit limitation.** The purpose of production is the provision of utilities, not the piling up of wealth either for the company or for individuals. Profits are therefore limited to 10% return on invested capital with no carry-forward of deficits in that return. The company maintains the price of its stock at par, and allows no stock splits or other evidence of capital gain.
9. **Distribution of surplus.** Ethical production will give rise to surplus. Surplus is distributed first by loan (through an ethical bank set up for this purpose) to capitalize companies which operate on (these) ethical principles, second by gift to community projects in which everyone can share, such as parks, education, art, music, and third, in foreign aid and development — again according to ethical principles.
10. **The market monitors investment.** Companies do not build up capital reserves for new equipment and expansion, save sinking fund for replacements. All requests for new capital are scrutinized by the ethical bank(s), which may take into consideration surplus loaned in the past.

—Robert R. Schutz
Pacific Y.M. Repr. to FCER

Do Simple Livers Miss the Boat?

Obviously, I think they do. Please don't misunderstand. I am not arguing for an extravagant, flamboyant, hypertensive, over-involved circus.. As Aristotle said, "Moderation in all things." But Simplicity? I think Friends are making a fetish of it, reminiscent of the rip-off, and to the detriment of themselves and the world. Maybe all the simplists want is a little less confusion in their hectic lives, and if that is the case we are together. But that is not what I read in their words, see in their lives.

We are really talking with Simple Livers about two main streams of thought, and there is often confusion between them (I hope it is not deliberate!). One is how to live life well in the 20th Century, and the other is how to do it cheaply. I will talk about both aspects, too, and try to keep them distinct.

Take, for example, the idea of reducing commitments, becoming less involved, having more time for yourself, doing your own thing. This sounds lovely at first blush because many of us tend to take on too much and cannot fulfill what we promise. We sink in a mire of guilt over deadlines missed and jobs undone. So we chop out a few committee assignments and learn to assess our abilities realistically (after a few disasters) in order to live well in the 20th Century. But do we unhinge and disinvolve and live a *simple* life? Even if we talk this line we don't do it; hence, more guilt. Really to become uninvolved means cutting all ties with the rest of humanity, becoming a nun, a hermit, schizoid or autistic, a self-centered elder. Isolation and alienation are certainly not goals of the good life, so let's stay connected. In fact, since we know that brains and muscles atrophy with disuse (and grow when they're stretched), let's connect and commit to the limit of our abilities, but not far beyond.

Some of us talk a lot about rural simplification. We hope to get away from it all and net months of free time by going back to the land. What a delusion! Farmers are largely deprived of human association, true, but in addition to long days of grueling labor, they are responsible for everything about their lives. They have to learn a hundred different skills and coordinate them all into the year's work that ties them down every minute of the day and many nights. Contrast the apartment dwellers whose lawn is mowed, pool heated, water piped, sewage drained, services brought to the door and garbage removed — all without their having to know or do anything about it. Rural simplification is a mirage that turns out to be an everlasting grind — unless it is well organized in a community, in which case it is one-tenth as complex as a private farm, 10 times as demanding as a city apartment. We don't often think of applying the lesson of simplicity to our relations with persons, but if we canonize this virtue, we'd better see what it says to

us in this area of our lives. Living alone, with no intimacies, is obviously far simpler than marrying, having X children, chasing 5 lovers of either sex, or participating in an intentional community. But what kind of a full, vigorous, generous, developmental, satisfying life does simplicity in this department give one? It is simply the wrong virtue to apply here, a fact which can not fail to cast doubt on its universality.

Simplicity requires reduction of life to ever smaller areas for sub-microscopic examination so that our small brains can begin to cope with the infinite complexity of the universe. Yet the harshest criticism that can be leveled against Science, in which this method has been wildly successful in limited areas, is reductionism. The methods of scientific analysis, by which more and more powerful tools are constantly zeroed in on smaller and smaller areas of inquiry, remove us from wholeness, understanding, and judgment, so that we shall never know what we have done to ourselves, to life and to our corner of the universe by our single-minded pursuit of simplicity as we go on congratulating each other over progress. A person and a generation seeking simplicity does not fit in a complicated universe, and according to Darwin (not a simplifier) survival is to the fit.

We often simplify our thinking to the point of making decisions on one or two bases, mainly economic. For example, a family may move in these fuel-short days to a house from which the man can bicycle to work. Good thinking, we say, light on the environment, cheap. But the family may now be farther from shopping, the Meeting, and friends, the schools of this neighborhood may be inferior, the incidence of burglary and rape may be high, traffic, noise, gas, and congestion may be unhealthy, neighbors may be snooty — in short, the simple single criterion, even though economic, easy, environmental, and laudable, may be entirely wrong. And there is nothing simple about taking account of all of the factors in making every decision. This is the opposite of reductionism.

I think our emphasis on simplicity confuses us in two economic areas, not one: — production and consumption. Simplicity, as interpreted by its advocates, says live lightly on the land, do without, pool resources, stay at the subsistence level, scrounge, get on welfare, share poverty with the miserable, participate not in the system of getting and spending that lays waste our powers, meditate, contemplate, enjoy leisure, and beg. We too easily assume that in order to consume less (a laudable goal, given poverty, hunger, and limited resources), we should produce less. And we further confuse getting out of the system with accepting its benefits through welfare. Our selfishness approaches stealing as we constitute a leisure class doing our own thing at the sufferance of workers whose generosity is extracted from them by a State attempting to meet needs of the legitimate poor. What Veblen could have done with this!

(Continued on page 64)

(continued from page 63)

Instead of allowing ourselves this privileged complacency in the name of simplicity, we should recognize that our production does not necessitate our own consumption. We have a moral obligation to produce what we can in this world of need that is as least as strong as our moral obligation to consume less than the standard of the average North American. Not only does high production reduce price and fill needs, it challenges and enlarges our powers, gives our lives meaning, and reduces the moral and intellectual rot that threatens to destroy the flower of our youth.

Of course, if we produce more and consume less, we shall have to deal with surplus. And this means another headache — not simplicity. We may have to study economics (a complicated subject), which is, to a large extent, the organization of surplus. Surplus runs the world, and we can *simply* opt out of our obligations to deal with money and power, or we can recognize our place in the 20th Century, take hold of our responsibilities, and deal morally with the complexity of the world that surrounds us.

I. Magnan Amity

Letters

Fox Never Did It

Dear Friend:

I wish Friends would take the trouble to open George Fox's *Journal* and Braithwaite's *The Beginnings of Quakerism* to check their facts. In the November, 1975, issue of the *Friends Bulletin*, p. 49, we read that "Many sects, including at least one Quaker group, have disrobed as a means of political protest." The Dukhobors use nakedness (and arson) as a means of political protest, but I have never heard of any Quaker group doing so. Braithwaite gives eight references to nudity as a sign in *The Beginnings of Quakerism*. However, the reasons given were: "as a sign amongst you . . . that you might see that you were naked and not covered with truth." (George Fox, quoted by Braithwaite, p. 148). Another motive was "as a sign to them and to the priests showing how God would strip them of their powers, and that they should be as naked as we was." (quoted by Braithwaite from *The First Publishers of Truth*, p. 149). The references all confirm that these extravagant persons were imitating Jeremiah's acted parables. Although there is ambiguity in these demonstrations, and in one incident cited by Braithwaite clothing is identified with hypocrisy of religious profession, we must conclude that to most of the demonstrators, nakedness was intended as a sign of weakness or downfall. We conclude also that the 17th Century was a different world from ours and that one difference lay in the fact that punishment by flogging was practiced on partially stripped persons.

On p. 51 of the same issue, Tom Greacen writes that George Fox disrobed and ran through the streets yelling

POSTMASTERS: SEND FORM 3579

FRIENDS BULLETIN

2081 Amherst St., Palo Alto, CA 94306

Second-Class Postage Paid at Palo Alto, California

"Woe to the bloody city of Litchfield (sic)." In the *Journal* (pp. 39-40 Everyman edition) Fox writes, "I put off my shoes . . . I went up and down the streets, crying with a loud voice, 'Woe to the bloody city of Lichfield'." He later was told that a thousand Christians had been martyred in Lichfield and "so I must go in my stockings . . ." G.F. even paid some shepherds to hold his shoes until he returned, washed his feet, and put on his shoes again.

Yours for the covering of truth,
Madge T. Seaver
San Francisco Meeting

A Christmas Wish

I

At song's serenest center silence sings,
Dispensing harmonies of joy in rings
Of light that break to arabesques of sound
And shine all careless winging toward the ground.

II

The works of love spread from the stillest core
To lave like pebbled circles what thirsty shore
They know not; they but keep their perfect form
Obedient to the outward-pulsing norm.

May love your Christmas shape with radiant art
And peace sit center to your singing heart.

Beach Langston
Orange Grove Meeting